ACCEPTE 04-19-00192-C

## **Challenge to Constitutionality of a State Statute**

URTH COURT OF APPEALS
SPINTONIO, TEXAS

This form must be completed by a party filing a petition, motion or other pleading **challenging the constitutionality of a state statute**. The completed form must be filed with the court in which the cause is pending as required by Section 402.010 (a-1), Texas Government Code.

Cause Number (For Clerk Use Only): Court (For Clerk Use Only): FILED IN

4th COURT OF APPEALS SAN ANTONIO. TEXAS

Styled: State of Texas v. Johnny Joe Avalos, Cause Nos. No. 04-19-00192-GR-80 No. 19-00193-CR

	0/20/2010 4.00.27 1 101
	KEITH E. HOTTLE CLERK
Contact information for party* challenging the constitutionality of a state statute. (*If party is not a person, provide	
contact information for party, party's representative or attorned	29.)
Name: Johnny Joe Avalos	Telephone: 210-378-6998
Address: 310 South St. Mary's Street, Suite 1910	Fax: 844-604-0131
City/State/Zip: San Antonio, Texas 78205	State Bar No. 00783557
Email: jgaristo67@gmail.com	
Person completing this form is: Attorney for Party Unrepresented Party Other:	
Identify the type of pleading you have filed challenging the constitutionality of a state statute.	
☐ Petition ☐ Answer ☐ Motion (Specify type):	
Other: Appeal of order denying pretrial motion and motion for new trial declaring penal code provision unconstitutional.	
Is the Attorney General of the State of Texas a party to or counsel in this cause?	
☐ Yes ☒ No	
List the state statute(s) being challenged in your pleading and provide a summary of the basis for your	
challenge. (Additional pages may be attached if necessary.)	
Mr. Avalos submits that Toyas Banal Codo Section 12	31(a)(2 violates the Fighth Amendment to the United States

Mr. Avalos submits that Texas Penal Code Section 12.31(a)(2 violates the Eighth Amendment to the United States Constitution, and its Texas counterpart, Article I, Section 13 of the Texas Constitution, and is therefore unconstitutional as applied to the facts of Mr. Avalos's case, because *in lieu* of the death penalty, which could not be imposed on Mr. Avalos given his well-documented intellectual disability, the statutory provision requires the default imposition of an automatic life sentence, without the possibility of a parole release, on an adult suffering from intellectual disability who is convicted of a capital offense. In support of his arguments, Mr. Avalos presents controlling and developing caselaw from the United States Supreme Court, and from a recent decision by an intermediate court of appeals from Illinois that is currently subject to review by the supreme sourt of that state.